

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JUL 24 2006

Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/527,464

Attorney Docket No. Q86804

REMARKS

Status of Application

Claims 1 and 3-8 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are allowed. Claims 5 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,739,741). Claim 6 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Preliminary Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the §102(b) anticipation rejection over Hanazaki with respect to claims 1, 3 and 4.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 5 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hanazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,739,741).

The Examiner alleges that Hanazaki discloses all of the elements of claim 5, using a similar argument to the one presented with regard to claim 1 in the Office Action dated November 29, 2005. The Examiner further states in the “Response to Arguments” section, that the Applicant’s arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive, because Hanazaki does have a pair of retaining projections R1 and R2. The Examiner, in the attachment 1 to the present Office Action, alleges that projections he has labeled as R1 and R2 correspond to the “a pair of retaining portions formed on a first pair of opposite side surface of the housing.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5, 7 and 8 are patentable over Hanazaki because: (i) the Examiner has mischaracterized the elements in claim 1; and (ii) Hanazaki fails to

Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/527,464

Attorney Docket No. Q86804

show all of the elements of claim 5, namely, Hanazaki fails to disclose “wherein said housing comprises a pair of retaining portions, . . . , formed on a first pair of opposite side surfaces of said housing, and a pair of retaining projections for retaining said cover formed on a second pair of opposite side surfaces of said housing.”

(i) First, the Examiner has mischaracterized the elements claimed in claim 1. In attachment 1 to the present Office Action, the projections the Examiner has labeled R1 and R2 correspond to the “a pair of retaining portions formed on a first pair of opposite side surface of the housing.” However, the projections labeled R1 and R2 in Hanazaki are provided to retain the cover. These projections would instead correspond to the “pair of retaining projections for retaining said cover formed on a second pair of opposite side surfaces of said housing” recited in claim 1. The projections R1 and R2 are not provided in Hanazaki as “a pair of retaining portions . . . formed on a first pair of opposite side surfaces of said housing . . . ”

(ii) Second, Hanazaki fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 1. In present Office Action, the Examiner fails to identify *two* pairs of retaining portions, one pair formed on *two* pairs of opposite side surfaces of each of the housing. As seen in FIG. 1 of Hanazaki, the housing 10 has only one pair of retaining portions, which are disposed to retain the cover 9. Thus, Hanazaki fails to teach a pair of retaining portions formed on a first pair of opposite side surfaces of said housing and a pair of retaining projections for retaining said cover formed on a second pair of opposite side surfaces of said housing.

Therefore, claim 5 is patentable over Hanazaki. Claims 7 and 8 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 5.

Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/527,464

Attorney Docket No. Q86804

Allowable Subject Matter


Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 1, 3 and 4. Applicants further submit that because claim 6 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 5, it has not been written in independent form at this time.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian W. Hannon
Registration No. 32,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 24, 2006